

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending. Claims 5-12 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-4 stand rejected. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

The specification stand objected for repeating the reference number “3b” twice at page 3, line 17. In response, applicant has corrected the error replacing the second “3b” with “3c” per instruction of the Office Action. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of this objection.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Harding (U.S. 4,793,840).

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, a calculation unit for “**calculating a change in the drawing speed with respect to change in time and estimating the drawing speed in a subsequent period.**” The present calculation unit calculates the acceleration or deceleration rate (or change in drawing speed with respect to change in time) of the drawing speed (Page 9, line 7 – page 10, line 5); as recited in claim 1. Then, a future drawing speed based on this calculated acceleration or deceleration rate is used to determine the adjusting rate of preform speed (Page 11, line 2 – page 12, line 11; see also claim 3). According to the specification, such calculation requires a comparison of a number of drawing speeds with respect to change in time (Page 9, line 15-16). Thereafter, a future drawing speed is predicted based on the calculated change in the drawing speed with respect to change in time (See page 10, line 2-6; see also claim 3).

In contrast, Harding teaches a control algorithm that **compares two drawing speeds, the preset drawing speed and actual drawing speed** (Claims 1 and 3, last clause; column 2, line 21-24); and based on difference of two speeds, the control algorithm adjusts the preform feed

rate (Column 3, line 1-13). In particular, applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does Harding disclose that the comparison of two speeds is made with respect to change in time. Thus, when Harding compares two speeds, it does not calculate the “change in the drawing speed with respect to change in time,” as recited in new claim 1. Accordingly, Harding fails to teach and anticipate all features of claim 1.

Instead, Harding, as noted above, merely compares the actual drawing speed to the preset drawing speed, and based on calculated difference of two speeds, Harding calculates the adjustment to the preform feed rate (Column 3, line 1-13). As such, Harding fails to disclose the calculating unit that estimates the drawing speed of a subsequent period, as recited in new claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Harding, therefore, fails to teach and anticipate all features of claim 1.

As Harding fails to teach anticipates all features of claim 1, applicant respectfully requests a reconsideration and removal of the rejection on claim 1.

Other claims in this application are each dependent on the independent claim 1 and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.


Amendment
Serial No. 10/619,995

Should the Examiner deem that there are any issues which may be best resolved by telephone, please contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Cha
Registration No. 44,069

Date: 10/12/05


By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:
Steve Cha, Registration No. 44,069
Cha & Reiter
210 Route 4 East, #103
Paramus, NJ 07652
Tel: 201-226-9245

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 10/12/05.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)


(Signature and Date) 10/12/05